

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
GILBERT, AZ
JUNE 2, 2021**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Carl Bloomfield, Chair
Jän Simon, Vice Chair
David Blaser
William Fay
Tyler Jones
Noah Mundt
Brian Andersen
Colby Ashton, Alternate (absent)
Anthony Bianchi, Alternate

COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT:

Scott September, Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT:

Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager
Amy Temes, Principal Planner
Ashlee MacDonald, Principal Planner
Stephanie Bubenheim, Senior Planner
Keith Newman, Senior Planner
Josh Rogers, Planner II
Alena Jorquez, Assistant Town Attorney

RECORDER:

Beth Ann Schuster-Moore

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bloomfield called the June 2, 2021 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:00 P.M. Reconvened at 6:14 P.M. following the Regular Session – began at Item 4.

1. **DR21-43 VERDE AT COOLEY STATION PHASE VI PAD K:** Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately .19 acres, generally located south of the southwest corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads, and zoned Gateway Village Center (GVC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Senior Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented DR21-43, Verde at Cooley Station Phase VI - Pad K, located at the southwest corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads.

Staff is requesting feedback on the following items:

1. Colors and Materials chosen for the building in relation to the rest of the site.
2. Incorporating fuego red brick on this building fronting Recker Road or another color brick/additional colors to provide greater movement and visual interest to the building.
3. Rear elevation of the building (south).

Phase VI is the last phase of the Verde at Cooley Station development and consists of one building (Pad/Building K) 1-story in height located along Recker Road at the southeastern corner of the master site plan. South of the building is the main E/W internal drive aisle and the recently approved Alta Cooley Station apartment complex.

The parking surrounding Pad K was approved in a previous phase DR19-59 (Phase II) and is currently under construction.

Landscaping is proposed around the building with some additional hardscape in differing patterns and is consistent with the approved landscape palette for Verde at Cooley Station. There is previously installed landscape along Recker Road and the landscape within the parking lot was included in a previous phase. The hardscape will blend into the existing hardscape along Recker Road right-of-way to further engage and widen the street frontage to allow for adequate foot traffic.

The preliminary grading and drainage are matching what has been approved within the site so there is not too much aside from the utility connections to the building to review for this design review.

This building is continuing with the stucco and fiber cement panels that are part of the development. This building has options to have multiple tenants or could be one, depends on the users that come in so there are samples of doors and different areas for signage. There is a provision as buildings located along the right-of-way are required to provide a minimum of 75% windows, doors, or window displayed coverage along the right-of-way frontage to provide greater transparency, this will be updated to be compliant.

Updates since the staff report were published; the owning coverings have changed color, some fuego red brick has been added as the wains coating along the bottom of the building and some of the stucco color blocking on the bottom has been modified. They are proposing to add a mural at the south elevation. The updated elevations were also shared.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Jones commented that he felt the project was a little bit plain compared to some of the other buildings that have been developed in this project. He noted he loved the project overall. It didn't quite fit the character, the idea of brick was great, it does have an odd southeastern corner which is a prominent entrance into the site, and it is a little strange with not a lot of landscape to hide that corner. Overall compared to the other things like on page 24, in my opinion, it doesn't fit in.

Commissioner Blaser commented, in addition to the opinion offered, it appears that they incorporate a little bit of brick, but it looks like it is just an attempt to incorporate a little bit of brick. The red brick would need to grow a little bit to tie into the rest of the development.

Chair Bloomfield inquired, in this area with Cooley Station, is there an overall common architectural review committee that reviews this for the private development?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded they do have the same ownership at the moment so their ownership acts as their property owner's association and does review the design of the buildings before they submit them to design review.

Chair Bloomfield inquired if they were comfortable with this and felt like it matched into their development just fine? Is that the assumption or do we know that?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded that is the assumption. They have been targeting trying to have a mixture of different buildings so that there is kind of different styles so some of the buildings are time and place and some are more modernized. But it is still seeking the cohesion of all the buildings complementing each other so we do ask for additional feedback from the commission.

Commissioner Mundt added he did not notice that there was the red brick. He noted that he sees there was an attempt but thinks it doesn't really integrate other than making it a grey building, suggesting there is more that they can do with that as well.

Chair Bloomfield noted he heard in the presentation about the south elevation would be right up against the main road and it does look plain and blank. Sometimes you need that in the back of the house if you are going to have some storage and different things you do not want to have big windows in the storeroom. But it still seems like an odd thing to have just a big blank wall right up against the main street when you are trying to create this pedestrian-friendly – pedestrian-scale development. It seems like an odd thing to do. It just seems to be out of place and out of character with what their professed intent is at the development.

Vice Chair Simon agreed with what has been said. He would like to see the brick a little higher, it seems to be an afterthought, agrees on the south side of the building to bring brick or character to the backside. Otherwise, he feels like the building looks okay where it sits is fine but feels like it needs a little more brick if going that route.

Chair Bloomfield added he likes the sides of the building that are detailed out, it is just the one blank wall that seems a little too blank, colors are fine as far as he is concerned, it blends and matches fine, it is the carrying of the fuego brick that seems to be an important thing.

2. **GP21-04 AVANTERRA:** Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 10.97 acres generally located south of the southeast corner of Gilbert Rd. and Civic Center Dr. from Residential 3.5 – 5.0 DU/acre to Residential 8.0 – 14.0 DU/acre. The effect of this amendment will be to allow a multi-family residential development.

Z21-06 AVANTERRA: Request to rezone approximately 10.97 acres of real property generally located south of the southeast corner of Gilbert Rd. and Civic Center Dr. from Single Family-35 (SF-35) zoning district to Multi-Family/Low (MF/L) zoning district with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district (PAD). The effect of this rezone will be to allow residential development with modified development standards.

Senior Planner Keith Newman presented GP21-04 Avanterra and Z21-06 Avanterra, located along the east side of Gilbert Road and south of the Wyatt apartment complex to the north and south of the town Public Safety complex. The property currently consists of an existing single-family home that will be removed upon the development of the property. According to the applicant, the intent of the project is to provide a rental community that will look and live very much like a single-family neighborhood.

Staff is requesting input on the proposed minor General Plan amendment and proposed PAD Rezone which includes three total deviations.

The existing land use classification is Residential > 3.5-5 DU/Acre. To develop the property as proposed, the applicant is requesting a minor General Plan amendment to Residential > 8-14 DU/Acre, which is consistent with their request for a density of 9.84 DU/Acre and 108 total units.

The site is near a mixed-use environment consisting of the Town of Gilbert Civic Center, Cadia Crossing Apartments, The Wyatt by Watermark Apartments, Towne Center Shops, and the Gilbert Town Square commercial/residential development to the north and northwest.

The applicant is requesting a rezoning for the subject site from Single Family-35 (SF-35) to Multi-Family/Low (MF/L) with a PAD overlay to accommodate the development of an attached and detached rental home community with 108 total units at a proposed density of 9.84 DU/Acre.

Access to the development will take place from a centrally located single point of access from Gilbert Road, with a secondary emergency access via an easement through the Wyatt apartment project to the north. The proposed units will consist of one-story and two-story standalone (detached) and tri-unit (attached) buildings in a range of open concept one, two, three- and four-bedroom floorplans with private fenced yards.

Site amenities consist of a clubhouse with a leasing office towards the front of the development, a swimming pool, a dog park, and a tot lot with grass at the southeast corner of the site. The landscape buffers along the parameter boundary on all sides.

The applicant is requesting three modifications to the Land Development Code standards as part of the Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay zoning listed in the table below in **bold**.

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC MF/L	Proposed MF/L PAD
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	36'	36'
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	25'	25'
Side (Single Family Residential)	25'	25'
Side (Multi-Family Residential)	20'	15'
Rear (Single Family Residential)	25'	25'
Minimum Perimeter Landscape Area (ft.)		
Front	20'	20'

Side (Single Family Residential)	20'	20'
Side (Multi Family Residential)	15'	15'
Rear (Single Family Residential)	20'	20'
Private Open Space (sq. ft./unit)	60'	60'
Common Open Space (Min.)	45% of net site	41.9%
Separation between Buildings (ft.) Single or two story	20'	10'

Deviation 1 – Town Staff has no concerns with this request as there will be minimal impact on the adjacent three-story apartment buildings and minimal impact to the proposed site based on the construction of the apartment buildings. Those apartment buildings are actually set back approximately 107 feet from the buildings along the northern boundary of the proposed project. Plenty of separation between buildings.

Deviation 2 – Town Staff does not support this modification, as the intent of the required 45% requirement is for larger common open space areas to be usable space that can be equally enjoyed by all residents within the development. While we understand that each unit is providing more private open space than required by code, the neighborhood will be better served and higher quality with more amenities and landscaping evenly distributed throughout the development for common use rather than having private back yards that only benefit individual tenants

Deviation 3 – Town Staff is still analyzing the modification requests to ensure proper compliance with Town Building and Fire Codes. But at this time there does not appear to be any major concerns with the applicant's request to reduce the building separation by 10 feet.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INPUT

A virtual neighborhood meeting was held on January 20, 2021. One surrounding property owner attended the meeting. Below is a summary of all concerns and questions brought up at the meeting:

- Questions were asked about improvements to Gilbert Road to accommodate turning movements;
 - *The Town Traffic Engineer has required a right turn decel lane for the site entrance, which will be restricted to right in and right out access only.*
- Concern about the southern driveway location as it may interfere with the schools pick up and drop off traffic demands;
 - *The proposed driveway has since been relocated further north to the middle of the proposed site.*
- Question about what type of wall is planned along the south boundary;
 - *An 8' tall block wall is proposed along the southern boundary.*

- Neighboring property owner stated that security is important to the school and that they would support an 8-foot wall along the southern property line;
- Questions about what is planned in the buffer along the south boundary.
 - *Trees and landscaping are proposed in the 25' wide buffer along the southern boundary of the site.*

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Mundt noted, from a zoning vantage point making this change given the very well overlay map provided that shows that it does not provide any major issues with changing to a multi-family. However, we find ourselves in a position again where immediately upon requesting one deviation they say the open space just doesn't exist. He noted he does not know if he is mistaken but he has not heard of saying the back yards are open space. He agrees with staff that there comes a point where there has to be some accountability to a standard that is set as a minimum. There are never developers in here saying we are going to put so much in that we would ever have to do a maximum and that minimum is treated as if it is a maximum number when it is spoken about well we gave all the required space. Given the location, it is very good to bring in more people that can access the amenities and all of the businesses across the street, will be a great thing and I think it is a good area of growth. But I would encourage a significant amount of more effort of putting in more open space prior to coming in with such a space design.

Commissioner Blaser noted he is excited about the product, single-family rentals detached and feels there is a need and a market for this. He noted he couldn't agree more with the opinion that has been offered and we need to maintain the minimum open space.

Commissioner Jones, the northern side where you have the Wyatt Project, those are three-story multiple family apartments. His question is on the eastern side which backs up to Legends Ranch and the school to the south – are those units that are proposed along the eastern side and on the southern side all single story?

Keith Newman responded yes, those units to the north are three-story, but along the eastern boundary for Avanterra they could be. They are tri-plexes and it is believed that all the tri-plexes are two-story units. There could be a single story tri-plexes, but we currently going through the design review process as well. I believe a majority of them are two stories and if I remember correctly there might be one that is a single story design. The southern boundary could be a mixture, the majority are two-story and may have a single-story version. Keith advised he can provide more information when they come back for the public hearing.

Commissioner Jones inquired – on the eastern side is that a landlocked piece?

Keith Newman advised that piece is kind of an anomaly, it is an exception and is a kind of landlocked piece. It is not currently owned by anybody. Keith advised it is a kind of an odd situation, but it is landlocked and his understanding is that Avanterra is hoping to purchase that piece in the future and then incorporating it into the project at some time in the future. As of right now, it is landlocked and an exception piece.

Commissioner Jones noted as it stands now it provides a buffer from the single family neighborhood to the east of it?

Keith Newman responded, that is correct and if they do incorporate this into the project, they do have a design that we are looking at through the design review that is kind of an alternative that would show units back in there. They would need to amend the PAD to do that.

Chair Bloomfield inquired about the connection on the north side? It seems odd where it is coming into the turnaround for the apartment complex. It that intended to help them with a secondary access.

Keith Newman advised that is correct, it is intended to be the development's secondary emergency access only and it will be gated. It will seamlessly transition right into the entrance for the Wyatt.

Chair Bloomfield noted that on the east side where they have the access corridor into that unclaimed property, it is paved but there really is nobody that gets back there or accesses it if it is not owned by anybody. Am I missing something, should we just leave an open tract there and maybe offer something different like turf with a good subbase so that you could have access there if you need to in the future, or is there somebody that actually occupies that property and uses it for something?

Keith Newman responded they provided that access to the back so that the property would not be landlocked technically. It kind of is today, so that is why they provided that access and as far as being able to turf or dg. Avanterra does not own and do not have a right to do anything with it – it is just an exception piece that they are providing access to satisfy a legal requirement.

Chair Bloomfield noted that the paved access that they have going back there, instead of paving it put DG down and call it good just to provide that access. He does not see a reason to make it paved because nobody is accessing it. Nobody owns it so nobody is going to access it provide the open spot and make it stable enough for people to get back there to maintain it if they need to.

Keith Newman responded he understands now, he can talk to the applicant about that and maybe that is something we would permit is maybe a dg type of access to it instead of it being paved.

Vice Chair Simon inquired where is the run-off is for this project.

Keith Newman responded the storage for retention will be underground for the most part, underneath the parking.

Vice Chair Simon inquired who owns that landlocked piece of property?

Keith Newman responded he does not know the answer. It is not a Town owned parcel, it is privately owned, but unaware who owns it.

Vice Chair Simon agrees with the sentiments regarding the open space. Overall, he likes the layout of the piece of property but feels like there is a great opportunity to make a central space like a park in the middle or something along those lines. He feels like the area that they have with the dog park and kids pad in the back, both are in the back and not going to be used by the front two-thirds of that property – there is an opportunity to make something in the middle and

makes this property more than just a long space for people to go in and out of their doors. We need to hold strong to the 45% minimum and look for other areas to be able to add that in.

Chair Bloomfield agrees this is an opportunity to create a sense of community in the center of the project. It does not look like they are using the open space creatively.

Commissioner Fay thanked Keith for the way he laid out the deviations, his comments nailed exactly how he feels about all of them. Commissioner Mundt nailed how he feels about the open space. He does not like the idea of enclosed space being counted against the common space requirement, that is marketing business decision. The deviation on the north side did not strike him as any big deal. The space between the buildings is very small. Both the right in and right out could cause a new wave of U-turn people in this vicinity with people leaving and coming and heading to the 202, which could start to get tough.

3. **DR21-49 GILBERT SPECTRUM BUILDINGS 9,10,11:** Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 18.5 acres, generally located south of the southwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads, and zoned Light Industrial (LI) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Senior Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented DR21-49 Gilbert Spectrum Buildings 9, 10 11 located on the southwest corner of McQueen and Elliott.

Staff is requesting feedback on:

- 1) the circulation of larger trucks throughout the site
- 2) colors and materials on the three buildings
- 3) enhancing amenity areas.

Requesting CD's At-Risk.

Buildings 9, 10, and 11 of Gilbert Spectrum are located along the southern portion of the master site plan at the southwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads. All three buildings will be 1-story warehouse industrial buildings with some office space and range in size from Building 9 at approximately 100,900 sq. ft., Building 10 at a little over 142,000 sq. ft. and Building 11 at approximately 66,400 sq. ft. There is an existing main drive aisle (Palo Verde Drive) that will provide direct access to McQueen Road from the site. A north/south main internal drive aisle connecting to the northern portion of the master site plan will be included in this phase.

Buildings 9, 10, and 11 are positioned at the southern portion of the Gilbert Spectrum master site plan. The buildings will share a large common service yard area internal to the site and the front entrances of the buildings will face the perimeter of the site along McQueen Road and the high school to the south. Parking will follow the length of each building around the perimeter of the site. The full motion signalized access at Palo Verde Drive will be extended to the west as a main internal drive aisle and an internal north/south main drive aisle along the west side of Building 1 will be included in this scope further connecting the existing build-out to the 3 new buildings.

Two main vehicular access points to the business park are provided, one from Elliot Road and the other from McQueen Road. The main service yard will not be gated and can be accessed from the Palo Verde drive aisle at a main internal intersection and at the west end of the Palo Verde drive aisle.

The site is designed to have retention flow to the large shared retention basin at the southwest corner of the site. Storm water is received through a series of underground interconnecting pipes. The northern section of Gilbert Spectrum is utilizing a separate retention basin.

The landscape palette and design matches and is consistent with the master site plan that they have been putting in along McQueen Road and Elliott.

Each building has an employee amenity area on the side of the building with additional landscaping. They are using some special decorative pavement for these areas and have sidewalks. Staff is seeking feedback on some additional amenities, trying to provide the same amenities that have already been approved with the other buildings. The other buildings have had some shade sails, benches, and trash receptacles.

The three buildings are all very consistent with what has been proposed for Gilbert Spectrum

Building 9, 10, and 11's design, color scheme, and materials are consistent with the Gilbert Spectrum. The main body of the buildings will be concrete tilt panel painted "Whole Wheat" with accents of "Sand Dune" around windows at intervals, and "Roxy Brown" is used at recessed entrances. The architecture of the three buildings mimics the architecture of Building 1 as they are larger and lengthy warehouse buildings. wing walls perpendicular to the horizontal plane of the building are placed at entrances to provide visual interest and will be painted "Black Bean". Tenant entrances are recessed into the building to provide depth and have store frontage windows. Entrances are further accented through the use of metal panel awnings to provide shade.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Mundt commented the colors and anything else related to the site layout looks fine. However, not sure about the traffic and large trucks within there, would also point out there is a large high school and a smaller elementary school directly across the street and daytime school 25 mph. When you have school letting out you have a significant amount of traffic there and when you add in a lot of heavy traffic and large tractor-trailers, etc. it is going to be a recipe for a lot of jam-ups and possibly accidents. Not certain about the internal turnings, but as it relates to the roadways, I am sure traffic is looking at this, but it is already a very densely traffic area during the school days.

Commissioner Jones commented he is less concerned about building 10, it is a very large building but because it is adjacent to the high school, tennis courts, and baseball fields he doesn't feel it is as much of an issue to dress that side up. On building 11 which fronts McQueen could use some additional work to kind of make it more attractive. As far as the traffic flow I don't know if it

would help to have the service entrance more towards the western side making trucks do that drive to reduce some of the risks that other non-truck traffic is trying to use those same entrances.

Commissioner Blaser commented that it is hard to tell as far as truck traffic how well it will function. I would encourage a real study done to make sure it is functional and I am sure the idea here is to be able to market the buildings and the developer should know best how to be able to market to the trucks or companies that are doing to bring trucks in. As far as amenities in these industrial parks there is a good chance that there aren't very many employees, it could be attracted to certain users and not make a difference to others. He noted he has a strong opinion on enhancing the amenities space. As far as colors he noted they are fine and ties into the rest of the development.

Commissioner Fay commented, having to pay for two fenders in this area, McQueen in the morning on the way south to the high school is a mess of traffic backed up all the way to Elliott or to the turn isle and teenagers who marginally know how to drive. There is a particular point in time, focusing on the morning, that needs to be studied for traffic. Other than the traffic he feels the project is just fine.

Chair Bloomfield agrees with what has been said, There is not a whole that you can do as far as access off McQueen. If it is a master development, he highly recommends, as a suggestion, that the new road that is being added perhaps smooth out the curb to Elliott. It makes sense and may give trucks an added way to get in and out of there without being caught up in the school traffic. It is a very large building and something that was designed in this part of town or intended to be in this part of town. You are not going to hide that massive building and the best you can do is kind of make it look uniform and he feels they have done this. Maybe they can paint an M for Mesquite High since they do not have a mountain to show school pride.

(** Adjourned to move to the Regular Session at 6:00 P.M. and reconvened at 6:14 P.M.)

4. **ST21-06 CAMELOT HOMES – STONE CREST:** Four (4) Standard Plans by Camelot Homes for 29 Lots on approximately 18.01 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Recker and Ocotillo Roads, zoned Single Family-10 (SF-10) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Senior Planner Keith Newman presented ST21-06 Camelot Homes – Stone Crest located at the southwest corner of Recker and Ocotillo Roads.

Planning Staff is seeking any additional feedback from the Commission relating to the proposed Standard Plans and would like specific feedback regarding the following:

1. Rear elevation variation and design for all plans (revision: the applicant has added a gable roof to the back of some of these elevations to satisfy staff's concern.)
2. Design of side elevations with blank wall space (revision: the applicant has proposed to add windows on the side to break that up.)
3. Gutters on side elevations for the Contemporary and Contemporary Modern styles (revision: the applicant has reduced the number of gutters to two to three which would satisfy staff's concerns.)

Keith noted that within the last couple of days, after writing the staff report and preparing this presentation, the applicant submitted to him revised elevation plans that pretty much address all three of these staff concerns. The revisions are noted above in the parenthesis.

Within the Stone Crest (Formerly Terraza) development, Camelot Homes is proposing new standard plan housing designs on 29 lots consisting of 85'x130' and 110'x135' sized lots and with minimum lot areas from 12,250 to 16,250 sf, with SF-10 zoning. The proposed designs consist of four different single-story floor plans ranging in size from approximately 3,094 sq. ft. to 3,721 sq. ft. (livable). Each plan proposes three to six different architectural styles consisting of Urban Farmhouse, Ranch, Prairie, Farmhouse, Contemporary and Contemporary Prairie. Keith shared a slide with the elevation matrix for all the plan designs.

The general details for each architectural style and the specific dimensions and square footage of each plan are provided in the tables below:

Plan Information Series Number	Maximum Livable Square Footage	Maximum Product (W x D)	Maximum Product Height
6001	3094	64'-6" x 74'-8"	19'-4"
6002	3647	65' x 76'-6"	20'-1 ½"
6005	3721	65'-6" x 93'-6 ½"	18'-4"
6006	3530	59'-8" x 81'-8"	21'-3"
6006 detached garage	982	24' x 42'-6"	17'-7"

The applicant has proposed ten (10) different color schemes to maintain a diverse streetscape. In addition to the diversity in colors (tans, off-whites, maroon, greens), variety is provided through the use of various materials such as stucco, brick veneer, stone veneer, wood shutters, wood rafter tails, board and batten siding, lap siding, metal awnings, wood posts, and columns and concrete roof tiles.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Commissioner Jones inquired about the detached garage, how does that work, where do they load from?

Keith Newman responded they load from the left side of the home down through the driveway toward the back half of the house towards the back yard.

Commissioner Jones inquired if that is for just one of the floor plans?

Keith Newman responded that is correct it only applies to plan 6006.

Commissioner Jones noted that overall, he feels they build to a high stand and feels they will build a nice project.

Commissioner Fay is a big fan, applauds the applicant for the amount of variation they created, and they really did match the surrounding community versus packing in as much as they possibly can.

5. **GP21-05 ALTA GILBERT:** Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 10.12 acres generally located at the northwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads from General Commercial to Residential > 25-50 DU/Acre.

Z21-07 ALTA GILBERT: Request to rezone approximately 13.71 acres of real property generally located at the northwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads from Community Commercial (CC) zoning district to 10.12 acres of Multi-Family/High (MF/H) zoning district and 3.59 acres of Community Commercial (CC) zoning district with a Planned Area Development overlay zoning district (PAD) to modify common open space requirements, private open space requirements, side and rear building setbacks, side and rear landscape setbacks, commercial drive-through locations, and commercial outdoor patio separation requirements. Stephanie Bubenheim (480) 503-6625.

Senior Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented GP21-05 Alta Gilbert and Z21-07 Alta Gilbert located at the northwest corner of McQueen and Elliott Roads.

Staff is requesting feedback on:

- 1) Input on the deviations proposed and the zoning request change in relation to surrounding uses.
- 2) General feedback on conceptual elevations and amenities.

Wood Partners is seeking to develop an Alta apartment development with adjacent commercial uses under a horizontal mixed-use concept on approximately 13.71 acres located at the northwest corner of McQueen and Elliot Roads with a portion of the existing vacant site remaining commercial zoning at the hard corner. The applicant has proposed a minor General Plan amendment to change the land use designation from General Commercial to Residential > 25-50 DU/Acre. The property is currently zoned Community Commercial (CC) and is part of the Provident Properties Planned Area Development (PAD) within the Northwest Growth Area. The applicant is requesting a zoning change to 10.12 acres of Multi-Family/High (MF/H) and 3.59 acres of Community Commercial (CC) all with a PAD. Alta Gilbert is proposed to be a 280-unit complex with 3-4 story buildings and approximately 27.7 DU/Acre. The Community Commercial portion of the site at the hard corner is conceptually planned for two drive-through restaurant uses.

The existing General Plan land use classification is General Commercial. The land uses are intended to encourage a variety of development opportunities, ranging from mixed-use to neighborhood-scale commercial uses, which support the large employment base to the west and southwest as well as the established residential neighborhoods to the north and southeast. The

applicant is proposing to change a portion (10.12 acres) from General Commercial to Residential > 25 – 50 DU/Acre to allow for the development of a high-density residential community.

The applicant states that the proposed land use change complies with the following General Plan policies, a full list is in the attached narrative:

- CM-1- Balanced Land Uses Policy 1 and 3
 - The site is strategically designed that manage development patterns and maintains the community character and is developing residential near compatible employment uses. The applicant also states the horizontal mixed-use concept makes more efficient use of the land.
- CN-1- Manage Congestion
 - The proposed residential use has a lower traffic count compared to a commercial shopping center and the location near employment will contribute to a reduction in vehicles being used.
- CM-3- Foster Gathering Spaces Policy 25
 - The indoor and outdoor gathering spaces are integrated into the development plan and will provide social interaction. Pedestrian connectivity and proximity to commercial parcels help promote the mixed-use concept.
- CN-2- Mobility Choice, Policies 8, 14, 32
 - Pedestrian and bicycle connections to the south and east will link the project site to retail and employment areas. Elliot Road's bus route 108 has a bus stop located along the site and will encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.
- CM-4 Promote Neighborhoods, Policy 6, 7
 - The applicant states that investing in housing will help support the aging neighborhood and will provide a distinct transition from single-family residential across the street to the commercial/employment uses to the south and west of the subject site.
- OP-1 Job Growth, p.67
 - The proposed rezone to multi-family will help the Town more than the property's current designations. The proposed multi-family housing will address statements made in the Town Council's recent retreat noting that trends show additional diverse housing types are critical part of attracting employers to locate in Gilbert.

Staff does not support the proposed General Plan amendment and rezone request. A critical component of building a resilient Gilbert is ensuring that our community has a balance of land uses and job opportunities. Commercial land uses provide supporting goods and services to large employment areas. Protection of land designated for non-residential uses, such as the subject site, is a key to achieving long-term sustainability. A number of policies in the General Plan support the existing non-residential land use or would support a change from Community Commercial to

another non-residential land use classification that would remain compatible with the surrounding employment uses:

- CM-1 and Policy 1- Ensure the Town maintains a land use framework that supports a highly livable community through the efficient use of land and resources
 - The Northwest Growth Area is designated in the General Plan as an economic hub of employment uses with the greatest percentage of employment in the town. The placement of a multi-family residential development in an industrial/employment corridor without adequate transition impacts the employment uses and opportunities for development.
- Policy 6 – Support the provision of appropriate transitions between sites having distinct changes in types or intensities of land uses
 - The transition of multi-family to industrial along the west property lines does not provide the same typical buffer of separation that would exist if the residential was existing and industrial was a new development.
- Policy 19- Support infill development that is designed to acknowledge the surrounding context
 - The proposed site is located adjacent to an existing industrial business park and the residential zoning will impact the flexibility of expansion or redevelopment of the adjacent employment uses.
- Policy 65 and 74 – Strategically provide water resources for a continuous sustainable water supply, conserve water
 - Water Conservation 1st review comments conclude that the proposed rezone will have a significant impact on water resources and will see an increase of 18.4 acre-feet of water per year.

The subject site is within the Northwest Growth Area, the town's largest percentage of employment is found within this growth area with large industrial and office oriented developments. The town's Economic Development Department is working through a vision plan for the Northwest Growth Area at this time. The 2020 General Plan indicates this area is targeted to be a vibrant hub for employment, redevelopment, and innovation within the community. While the general plan does state the Northwest Growth Area should attract housing development, the focus of the growth area is redeveloping existing uses and promoting job growth and longevity.

The deviations that are requested: **Project Data Table Multi-Family/High**

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC MF/H	Proposed Alta Gilbert MF/H
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	55'	55'
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	25'	25'
Side (Street)	25'	25'

Side (Nonresidential)	10'	10'
Rear (Nonresidential)	10'	10'
Minimum Landscape Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	25'	25'
Side (Street)	20'	20'
Side (Nonresidential)	10'	10'
Rear (Nonresidential)	10'	10'
Minimum Common Open Space	40%	31%
Minimum Private Open Space	Each unit/60 sf	Some units/60 sf
Interior Common Open Space	10 sf/unit	25 sf/unit

Project Data Table Community Commercial

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC CC	Proposed Alta Gilbert CC
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	35'/2-story	35'/2-story
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	20'	20'
Side (Street)	20	20'
Side (Residential)	30'	10'
Side (Nonresidential)	15'	10'
Rear (Residential)	40'	10'
Minimum Landscape Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	20'	20'
Side (Street)	20	20'
Side (Residential)	25'	10'
Side (Nonresidential)	15'	10'
Rear (Residential)	30'	10'
Separation between Buildings 1-story	15'	15'
Landscaping	15%	15%
Drive-through within 50ft. of Residential designation	No	Yes
Commercial outdoor activities and restaurant outdoor patios within 50ft. of Residential	No	Yes

The Alta Gilbert MF/H PAD deviations include a reduction in the common open space requirement from 40% to 31%. The applicant notes that additional common open space amenities are provided within the buildings on multiple levels to provide adequate common space areas for future

residents. This includes an increase in the minimum indoor sf requirement from 10sf per unit to 25sf per unit totaling an additional 6,000 sf of indoor amenity areas for the 280 units.

Alta Gilbert is also seeking a reduction in the requirement of private open space patios for each unit. Currently, the code requires every residential unit includes a private unit patio with a minimum of 60 sf. The development is proposing to remove the requirement for all units and provide outdoor patios on only some units. The unit number is undetermined at this time.

To create a horizontal mixed-use project as depicted by the developer a reduction to building and landscape setbacks are proposed to provide shorter distances between the MF/H and CC developments. Along the interior property lines between the MF/H and CC zoning district the applicant is requesting to reduce the building and landscape setbacks to 10'. These setbacks can vary between 15'-40' depending on the setback orientation between residential to commercial. The applicant notes that this is a viable modification to create a horizontal mixed-use project. *Staff has requested additional justification on the benefits of reducing the setbacks has for the development and how the MF/H and CC developments will interact with each other on a pedestrian level.* Additionally, staff notes that auto-oriented uses, such as the drive-through restaurants anticipated are not in line with a pedestrian-friendly integrated project.

In addition to the setback reductions, the applicant is also requesting to modify two regulations under the CC zoning district pertaining to drive-through restaurant locations and restaurant outdoor patios. Currently, the LDC states that drive-throughs and restaurant outdoor patios cannot be located within 50 ft. of residentially zoned property. The applicant is requesting to remove this requirement in order to allow more flexibility with designing the future CC sites as they are small sized lots and the 50'X250' landscape requirement at the intersection further impacts the flexibility of designing the site. The applicant would also like to promote outdoor patio seating areas for future tenants and not be limited by distance requirements for a horizontal mixed-use project.

Outdoor amenities include a pool area with cabanas, tree area, game lawn and about 7,000 sf for indoor amenities including an athletic center, business center, clubhouse kitchen area, and package delivery service.

The pedestrian circulation illustration and conceptual elevations were shared with the Commission. There has not been a full design review on the elevations; however, feedback and comments are welcomed.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Vice Chair Simon noted there a lot of deviation requested here and I am not necessarily sure I am ready to give up the community commercial for the residential. Although I do understand that possibility or concept with regards to this employment corridor and bringing more residential and walkability to maybe the industrial or the aerospace that is across the street and some of the other surrounding areas. I am not necessarily a fan of the way this is laid out either, can not put his finger on it, does not necessarily like the two three-story buildings on the northeast corner are stacked, not a fan of the reduction in the common space on either the private common or the

community common space and some of the other deviations that they are looking for. If I were to go forward with the rezone on this, I would definitely hit on some of those areas with regards to what they are requesting and try to look at a different layout. Not necessarily sure that he is okay with giving up the community commercial at this point.

Commissioner Mundt noted he applauds the applicant. This looks like a very nice community given that we just talked about the traffic on this road I won't get into the traffic that would be within two drive-thru restaurants stuffed on the corner surrounded by multi-family. It seems like the developer is doing what you would ask for if going into negotiations. In the midst of industrial and residential putting massive multi-family that has 27.7 units per acre and four stories, it seems like they said let's keep the best aspects of commercial and put drive-thru which probably couldn't get approved, but let's just throw that in there as some kind of a smoke show and forget the fact that we are now going once again into open space. There is a reason the standards are set, and the minimums are set because it helps the community to maintain some form of standard. I cannot remember a time other than once, that someone came in and actually had over. There has been over when they call the back yards open space, there has been under even with calling the back yards open space and at some point, there has to be some kind of reconciliation of whether or not that logic is actually valid. Personally, I don't think it is. It seems like a significant amount of conciliations that are being asked of without any reasoning outside of we can jam a lot more really big buildings in here and then there is a bunch of interpretations about the way that somehow ties to the northwest corridor based upon the staff report does not seem to be coherent with what the actual logic of that document states. I would say I take some issue when you come in asking for a significant amount of deviations when there was absolutely no effort in any way to do something else of any merit of alterations to the site. For that reason, among others with the traffic and the other industrial uses going in and the schools in that area, along with more importantly the property rights of these industrial people directly to the west where what if one day they say we want to put four story high rises. Well, now you're looking at 150 foot set back. It seems there could be some work. I like the idea; it is very well designed.

Commissioner Fay noted he felt this was a tough project to assess, it is a tough area unless you have the right kind of warehouse. He notices they put bicycles in every rendering and some of them – where are they coming from, they can't even get to where they are. One of the ideas of putting a restaurant with a drive-thru or a fast food with a drive-thru so close to residential or to the multi-family does not bother me that much. In fact, it might even start to cross into cool amenity if it is done right. That part of the deviation didn't bother me, because everything else did. It does seem like the justifications to say why this is consistent with the general plan and with the northwest district just does not really fly and seems to stand out painfully in an area where it does not fit. It is just not the setbacks; it is the combination of the rezoning and the setbacks together that really hit the property to the north and the west. The open space is bothersome and something I wouldn't want to buy into to. The interior open space. are they talking about the area around the pool inside?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded that the common open space requirement is anything that is on the ground floor that is outdoors. So, pool amenity areas, BBQs, or dog runs. That would count in the 31% and anything that is private open space or interior means that it is inside the building, such as a leasing office, fitness, clubhouse so that is their interior open space for their tenants. Part

of the multi-family high zoning district, the reason that it was created, some of the concepts were that there are more high density urban type of developments where there is not as much space on the ground so they are looking at providing those amenities maybe like outdoor rooftop deck type of amenities that are for the residents within the building.

Commissioner Fay noted this is a tough one but not a fan.

Commissioner Blaser noted he does not have anything to add but his opinion is right in line with what has been expressed.

Chair Bloomfield commented regarding the ULI study that talked about the need up in this northwest character area, I know the town has always held out that this would be an area where we could develop some commercial and industrial uses and we have seen some progress that way in the last few years. This is the second case that I recall coming up on this piece of property with a similar kind of use and a request and the ULI study one of the things they suggested was in this area you don't have enough mass of people here to supply live work and play uses and it kind of is an area of town and it made sense to me to have maybe some existing commercial across Gilbert Road from the Town center and the need for more housing, more residents in the area to be able to go and walk and be here and support these businesses because there was a time when it was difficult and not very vibrant. Now it is, we have more residents here and they go there, they support those businesses that are local to them and it seems in my mind it makes sense that we would want some sort of multi-family, competent of it, that comes into the northwest character area. I am curious as to what staff envisions in that regard and maybe we will know more as we go through the LDC and see that next month and it will become a little more apparent to us, but any feedback in that regard would be appreciated.

Stephanie Bubenheim responded the northwest growth area with that ULI report did note that part of the redevelopment towards the northwest growth area for employment uses it is helpful to have supportive residential so that there are bodies that are utilizing the services in that area. In 2018, there was a development that was brought forward to study session that was single family residential and that ended up not moving forward but it was taking up the full 13 acres of the site and kind of the same notes from planning at that time was that residential has a lot of impact to the industrial adjacent to this use so we do note that residential is an important component for the northwest growth area but it is really assessing how it impacts the adjacent uses as well. We are having continued conversations with our economic development team to try to give you a more thorough presentation at the public hearing.

Chair Bloomfield in regard to that the ULI study and the in-house development team, is there more weight given to one than the other or does staff view those as the same?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded the staff takes the ULI study into consideration as kind of a guiding document moving forward with the northwest growth area. So economic development based on that ULI report is working through a vision plan and they brought that recently to Council to continue moving forward with the vision plan so that is in the works. The development team, in-house, assess sites based on how we have seen land use development over the years and then also kind of seeking out studies. We have requested economic development to work out a market study to give some more data and feedback on the impacts of removing that community

commercial. We also want to be cognizant of maintaining any possible community commercial or for office or redeveloping rezoning sites into light industrial as well or industrial employment uses so that we can continue to grow the northwest growth area for employment as well.

Chair Bloomfield thanked Stephanie for the feedback. Chair Bloomfield noted that he hears the opinions offered and knows that they are valid and at the same time he is not necessarily opposed to multi-family in this area on this piece of property. He noted he thinks there are some aspects that he liked but there certainly are somewhat of a novel being written not necessarily based in fact – a fact based novel, written in the report from the applicant. It might be easy to say that but at the same time, I do not want to discount the opportunity that might exist here because I think that there is a need for some of that and weights out in the ULI report. He noted he is not completely opposed, some changes need to be made, it is not all bad.

Commissioner Andersen inquired about the deviations of the minimum private open space that each unit is supposed to have 60 square feet, some units will have 60 square feet. Can you provide additional information on what that means?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded for the private open space, all units that are part of the complex are required to have an outdoor patio for their open space and they have those requirements for the footage. For this request they are requesting to deviate that so that just some units have the 60 square feet requirement so that not all units would have an outdoor patio, some might have a smaller square footage and 60 some might just have a Juliet window and not have a full outdoor patio so that was the request to change that from all units to just some units.

Commissioner Andersen noted that is a sticking point, he does not feel that is a deviation that should go away. It is not unreasonable to ask a developer to provide at least 60 square feet per unit and suggests that the way it is written it says some units which means, some could be five units out of 280 and the rest are doing just what you are saying that they won't have patios or balconies others have the Juliet and others could have 10 square feet for balcony space. In my opinion, I think that deviation needs to go away, there is no reason why the developer the architect can't design units to meet such a small requirements. My thoughts on the whole commercial piece, I think I am okay just looking at the site plan but the setback deviation that they are requesting, I know it says drive-thru next to residential but the residential here is multi-family, not single family where if people are buying these they are kind of stuck and if they don't like hearing the noise of the outdoor eating areas it is harder for someone to sell their house compared to they could just move to the next new multi-family project that is out there. It is a lot easier for them to react to something they might not like that is next to the development.

6. **GP21-02 MARRIOTT TOWNEPLACE SUITES:** Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 2.6 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Mercy and Pecos Roads from Public Facility/Institutional to General Commercial. The effect of this amendment will be to change the plan of development to allow commercial development.

Z21-04 MARRIOTT TOWNEPLACE SUITES: Request to amend Ordinance No. 2210 pertaining to the Celebration Center Campus Planned Area Development overlay

zoning district (PAD) by removing from the Celebration Center Campus PAD approximately 2.6 acres of Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I) zoning district generally located at the southwest corner of Mercy and Pecos Roads, approving the Development Plan for the Marriott TownePlace Suites PAD; and changing the zoning classification of said real property from 2.6 acres of Public Facility/Institutional (PF/I) zoning district to 2.6 acres of General Commercial (GC) zoning district, with a PAD, to modify building height requirement and minimum rear building and landscape setbacks.

DR21-31 MARRIOTT TOWNEPLACE SUITES: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 2.6 acres, generally located at the southwest corner of Mercy and Pecos Roads, and currently zoned Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I), pending zoning approval.

Senior Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented GP21-02 Marriott TownePlace Suites, Z21-04 Marriott Townplace Suites and DR21-31 Marriott Townplace Suites located at the southwest corner of Mercy and Pecos Roads.

Staff is requesting feedback on:

1. Staff requests Planning Commission input
2. Planning Commission input on deviations requested
3. Planning Commission input on colors and materials of hotel.

The subject site, 2.6 gross acre site and currently zoned Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I), is within the Val Vista Medical Growth Area designated on the General Plan. This growth area is located south of the Loop 202 freeway with the Mercy Gilbert Hospital acting as an anchor and is focused on medical, medical research, and rehabilitation/care facilities. Support amenities include mixed-use, commercial, and hospitality uses to supplement the medical and employment uses. The proposed hotel site will contribute to the variety of hospitality uses within close proximity of the hospital, medical offices, and surgery centers.

The site is located at the southwest corner of Mercy and Pecos Roads adjacent to the Loop 202 Santan Freeway and Pecos Road overpass. Access is provided along Mercy Road. The site is within the Val Vista Medical Growth Area and the Santan Freeway Corridor Overlay Zoning District. Marriott TownePlace Suites is a brand of Marriott hotels, this site is proposing 84-guest suites. Due to the irregularly shaped lot the building is designed in a creative way to provide additional guest suites over drive aisles. The building is situated at the center of the site and is meeting all building setbacks. The parking lot drive aisles transect the building in two places and the pool amenity area is located on the ground level towards the southwest corner of the site. Access is provided along Mercy Road with an emergency access only road proposed at the north corner of the site.

The 4-story building ground level has the hotel lobby, breakfast area, fitness center and employee uses with the upper levels housing the guest suites. The suites will be extending over two the parking lot drive aisles with staircases at both ends. The main entrance has a porte-cochere and outdoor patio area before entering into the building. The building footprint does provide movement to the building and there are transitions from parapet roof lines to shed roofs at sections.

The site is located within the Santan Freeway Corridor Overlay zoning district which has additional regulations for types of uses. The hotel site does not qualify as a noise sensitive use and it has been determined that an ADOT noise study is not required. ADOT has recommended that exterior and interior building finishes should employ industry standards to mitigate noise levels and amenities should be located away from the freeway when possible.

The applicant is requesting a minor General Plan amendment to General Commercial in order to allow for a hotel to complement the surrounding area and requesting to remove the subject site from the Celebration Center Campus PAD and rezone the site from Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I) to General Commercial with a PAD.

The site is an oddly shaped parcel with limited frontage and access. The property owners acquired additional land through excess right-of-way from the Town of Gilbert and ADOT to gain some additional square footage. Due to the unique shape and small size the applicant is seeking PAD deviations to increase the flexibility for the design of the site. Vehicular access can only be provided along Mercy Road due to the grade change on Pecos Road and the proximity to the freeway overpass. An emergency fire access only is proposed along an ADOT access road onto Pecos Road and the applicant has provided confirmation that an agreement is underway for this access. In addition, a 30' easement for the Santan Freeway Trail is required to be provided on the site to provide a connection of the trail along the northwest property line adjacent to the Santan Freeway connecting to Pecos Road and across to Discovery Park.

The site is located along the Loop 202 Freeway Corridor, the corridor has multiple vertical overlay districts. The subject site is located immediately adjacent to Vertical Development Overlay Area 5. This overlay permits height increases for certain zoning districts with the adjoining property to the west being allowed a maximum height of 90ft/6-stories. As the site is located directly along the freeway corridor and within the Val Vista Medical Growth area the applicant is seeking a PAD deviation request to increase the height requirement from 45' to 59' to allow for the 4-story hotel. The height is comparable along the freeway corridor and there are multiple hotel sites directly north of this area across from the freeway that are multiple stories in height.

The applicant is also seeking a reduction of the rear landscape setback along the freeway right-of-way. Due to the small size of the site and odd shape the applicant is seeking to gain more flexibility in design with a rear setback reduction to 5' as the development parking, drive aisle, and landscaping will not impact the freeway. The rear buffer will be adjacent to an ADOT wall and shielded from public view. It is also noted that the hotel developments, constructed under the ULDC, on the north side of the freeway have 5' setbacks adjacent to the freeway. This deviation may be changed due to the trail easement requirement.

Project Data Table

Site Development Regulations	Required per LDC	Proposed GC
Maximum Height (ft.)/Stories	45'	59'/4 stories

Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	25'	25'
Side (Street)	20'	20'
Side (Nonresidential)	20'	20'
Rear (Nonresidential)	20'	20'
Minimum Landscape Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	25'	30' (trail easement)
Side (Street)	20'	20'
Side (Nonresidential)	20'	20'
Rear (Nonresidential)	20'	5'
Landscaping (% of net lot area)	15%	33.8%
Off-Street Parking and Loading	1.1 spaces per guest room 92 spaces required 3 passenger loading spaces	92 spaces provided 1 passenger loading spaces

The grading and drainage, there is some surface retention is proposed at the west corner and southern areas of the site and an underground storage tank is provided along the northern parking lot drive aisle.

The colors and materials chosen are EIFS in gray, white, and an earthy green color. Two fiber cement panels, one a horizontal shiplap siding in a darker brown and vertical hardie panels in beige with wood-like grooves provide diversity of materials. The building is broken up into segments through the use of transitioning the colors and materials. *1st review comments include providing distinct transitions as to not be flat material change transitions and to assess the placement of the colors and materials to be more proportionate with the building. Potentially using one material for the ground level of the building so the section "legs" are matching. The porte-cochere is an interesting shape but does not feel integrated into the rest of the building.*

There are three lighting types proposed, parking lot, building wall mounted lighting, and canopy recessed lighting. The parking lot lights are mounted at 25 feet and all building mounted lighting is meeting the 14' height requirement. All site lighting will be required to comply with Town codes.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Chair Bloomfield noted that all the deviations requested made sense, there is nothing there that was asked for that caused any concern. Given the proximity to the freeway, Pecos Road and everything that is around it, it all fits, matches and goes well. He likes the layout and the materials and color scheme seems to work. Overall, he commented he likes it, there are bound to be some changes and variation to what we see here. Commented he sees what is noted about the

different materials having different legs but at the same time I am not sure that having a uniform leg along the front and ground floor makes much sense either. He encourages the architect to take a look at that. A good use for the area and matches what is going on to the north side and no concerns overall.

Commissioner Mundt commented that he agrees that on the highway, the height is an increase but given the location there is not real issues with that. He commented that he likes the way they designed the roof variations and the colors, especially the light blueish. He requested additional information regarding the path. Thinks it is good and perfect for the area next to the hospital and medical is necessary and feels they did a good job.

Stephanie Bubenheim responded the trail easement is a 30 foot wide trail easement, a major trail along the freeway. It is part of the trails master plan, in discussions with transportation planning it is bet suited to have it located following the freeway as it has been all along the loop 202 so you can see the trail on other developments. Right now, along the hospital it has a 10 foot DG path and a 6 foot sidewalk with some landscaping. There has been some negotiation on where the trail is best suited.

Vice Chair Simon note he feels it is a great use for this property, well situated on the parcel as well. Do they have enough parking spaces to accommodate in the event that they book every room?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded that right now they are right at their parking requirement; however, they are missing two loading spaces at the entrance. A requirement is that they do have three loading spaces, they only have room for one. Part of the first review comments noted that they are not meeting the parking requirement at this time so they will have to look at redesigning the site to fit more parking or looking at the unit count to make the parking work.

Commission Jones inquired; this is currently zoned Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I) requesting to General Commercial. Is the 45 ft. height restriction the General Commercial or does it apply to the Public Facilities/Institutional zoning?

Stephanie Bubenheim responded that the 45 ft. height restriction is under the current General Commercial in the Land Development Code.

Commissioner Jones commented overall, it fits, he likes it. There are some surrounding residential uses here at least for now and so I have some hesitation on the height restriction request to increase 14 ft. There is a pool amenity oddly placed on the site especially for what every comes in on the side of the site. Maybe the applicant would consider moving the pool to a roof top pool to move that amenity, potential shuffling some of those pieces around could almost stay withing the height restriction on a three-story product and still have those same amenities and still protect those adjacent residential uses.

Commission Fay commented this is an acquired piece in an acquired location and it is a great use for something that I think would be difficult to fill in short of a junk yard, etc. He feels it is a good use for. He noted he is a fan.

Chair Bloomfield commented as far as the parking places if they are able to shift that easement for the trail to make it shorter it may give them enough land space to have the additional parking

spaces added that they need and encourages landscaping such as trees to offset all the asphalt and parking.

5. DISCUSSION OF REGULAR MEETING AGENDA:

Chair Bloomfield proposed moving Item 14, Item 15, Item 16, Item 17, Item 18, and Item 19 to the consent agenda.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Study Session to begin Regular Session at 6:00 P.M.

Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Study Session reconvening at 7:20 P.M.

Carl Bloomfield, Chairman

ATTEST:

Beth Ann Schuster-Moore, Recording Secretary